

*Not used*

Def. Doc. No. 2067

Extract from the Minutes of the Subcommittee  
of the Heads of Delegations on Pacific and  
Far Eastern Questions (Washington Conference  
1921 -- 22 )

BARON SHIDEHARA asked whether the meaning of Article VII was that, when one Power thought a discussion "of such application" was desirable, then all the Powers concerned should communicate with one another.

THE CHAIRMAN said that he supposed it meant that, if any Power thought the application of any stipulation of the Treaty ought to be discussed, it could send notes to all the other parties to the Treaty and state that fact; the other Powers would then fulfill their obligations under the Treaty by stating their views in the matter.

BARON SHIDEHARA asked if the other Powers would be bound to answer.

THE CHAIRMAN believed that they would; for instance, if a situation arose in China which concerned Power A and involved the principle of the open door and which Power B thought ought to be discussed, Power B would write to the other Powers; the others would say that it was their duty to exchange views in regard to the matter. The Article recognized the principle of exchange of views on such questions -- the exchange to take place presumably, through ordinary diplomatic channels.

BARON DE CARTIER said he presumed no conference would be called.

Def. Doc. No. 2067

BARON SHIDEHARA said that, if one Power thought a matter ought to be discussed, then, according to the wording, all the Powers must be notified.

THE CHAIRMAN thought the Article meant a little more than that one Power should merely tell the others what it thought. The real point was that all the Powers parties to the Treaty recognized that they should exchange views, if a situation arose which one Power thought ought to be discussed. If one Power initiated such a discussion, it might be told by another Power that it was wrong and that there was nothing to discuss, or it might be told that it was right, or that it was partly right.

BARON DE CARTIER said the Article gave one Power the right to open a discussion and to ask for the views of the other Powers. ~~BARON DE CARTIER said that, if one Power thought a matter~~  
MR. KAMMERER said that when several Powers had signed a treaty and Power A perhaps did something contrary to it in the opinion of Power B, Power B would go to Power A before talking to the other parties to the Treaty; that was the normal course; if such direct conversations between Powers A and B did not ~~the~~  
~~Treaty recognized that they should exchange views, if a situa-~~  
~~tion arose which one Power thought ought to be discussed.~~  
~~one Power initiated such a discussion, it might be told by~~  
~~another Power that it was wrong and that there was nothing~~  
~~to discuss, or it might be told that it was right, or that it~~  
~~was partly right.~~

BARON DE CARTIER said the Article gave one Power the



Def. Doc. No. 2067

help matter, B could communicate "fully and frankly" with the other Powers. This was the normal procedure and Mr. Kammerer said he did not see anything new in such a proposition.

THE CHAIRMAN said that there was nothing new in it; it merely carried out the spirit of association of the Powers represented at the Conference. The words "fully and frankly" were in scores of treaties; they meant little because Powers could communicate "fully and frankly" with each other in any case, and if they were friendly Powers, they probably would do so.

Def. Doc. No. 267

C E R T I F I C A T E  
Statement of Source and Authenticity

I, HAYASHI, Kaoru, Chief of the Archives Section, Japanese Foreign Office, hereby certify that the document hereto attached in English consisting of 2 pages and entitled "EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HEADS OF DELEGATIONS ON PACIFIC AND FAR EASTERN QUESTIONS (WASHINGTON CONFERENCE, 1921 -- 22)" is an exact and true extract from the book entitled "CONFERENCE ON THE LIMITATION OF ARMAMENT--SUBCOMMITTEE--WASHINGTON, NOVEMBER 12, 1921 -- FEBRUARY 6, 1922 (Pages 360 -- 362)" published by Government Printing Office, Washington, 1922, and is in the custody of the Japanese Foreign Office.

Certified at Tokyo,  
on this 17th day of January, 1947

/S/ K. Hayashi (seal)

Witness: Nagaharu Udo (seal)



Def Doc 2067

Not used

太平洋及極東問題首席代表委員分科會議事錄摘要

(大正十年一十一年華府會議)

幣原男爵、第六條ノ意味ハ一國ガ「新ル適用ニ關スル」議論カ望マシト考ヘタル時ハ一切ノ關係國ハ相互ニ通報スヘシトノ主旨ナリヤト問フ

委員長曰ク 本條ハ左ノ如キ意味ナリト考フ 即チ若シ一國ガ本條約ノ何レカノ條項ノ適用ガ論議セラレベキナリト思考スル場合ニハ本條約ノ他ノ一切ノ締約國ニ覺悟ヲ送り右事實ヲ陳述シ得ルモノナリ、新ル他ノ諸締約國ハ當該事項ニ關スル自己ノ見解ヲ陳述スルニオイテハ本條約上ノ自己ノ義務ヲ果スモノナリ

幣原男爵 他ノ諸締約國ハ同答ヲナス義務アリヤト問フ、

委員長曰ク、新ル義務アリト考フ 例ヘバ支那ニ於テ甲國ニ關係シ且門戶開放ノ原則ニ關聯アル事態ガ發生スル場合乙國ガ本事態ハ論議セラルベキナリト考フルニ於テハ乙國ハ他ノ諸締約國ニ通報スベク他ノ諸國ハ該事件ニ關スル意見ヲ交換スル義務アリト云フベシ、本條ハ新ル問題ニ對スル意見交換ノ原則

Aug Dec 2007

シ、自國ノ新ル直接交渉ガ役ニ立タサル場合乙  
國ハ前ノ諸國ニ對シ「充分ニ且卒直ニ」通報スルコ  
トヲ得。以上ハ普通ノ遣リ方ニテ新ル提案ニハ別ニ  
新奇ナルモノヲ認メズ

委員長曰ク 本條ニハ何ヲ新シキ點ナシ本條ハ現ニ  
本會議ニ参加セル諸國ノ聯繫的精神ヲ具現シタルモ  
ノニスキス「完全且卒直ニ」トノ文言ハ澤山ノ條約  
ニテ、各國ハ如何ナル場合ニモ互ニ「完全ニ且  
卒直ニ」通報シ合ヒ得ルモノニシテ又友好國間ニホ  
イテハ多分實際ニモソノ般主スベキヲ以テ本文實ハ  
別段ノ意味ヲ有スルモノニ非ス



Doc 2067

ヲ認ムルモノナリ、右意見ノ交換ハ多分普通ノ外交  
経路ヲ通シ爲サルベシ

ド、カルチエ男爵曰ク 合議ガ招集サレルモノニ非  
スト考フ

幣原男爵曰ク 若シ甲國ガアル事件ヲ論議スベシト  
考フル場合本文句ニヨレバ一切ノ他締約國ヘ通知サ  
レル事ヲ要ス

委員長曰ク 本條ハ單ニ一國ガ他國ニ對シ自己ノ考  
ヲ述ブルト云フ以上ノ多少ノ意義アリト考フ。アル  
事件ガ發生シアル一國ガ之ニ對シ論議スベキナリト考  
フル場合、本條約ノ一切ノ締約國ヘ意見ヲ交換スベ  
キコトヲ承認セリトノ點ガ要點ナリ若シ一國ガ新ル  
論議ヲ持出シタル場合ハ他國ヘ之ニ對シ其ハ間違ナ  
リ論議スベキコトナシトカ又ハ其ハ正當ナリトカ將  
又アル點正當ナリトカ答フルベキナリ

ド、カルチエ男爵 本條ハ一國ニ對シ論議ヲ開始シ  
他諸國ノ見解ヲ尋ヌル權利ヲ與フルモノナリト云フ  
カンメラー氏曰ク 茲國ガ本條約ニ署名シ、甲國ガ  
乙國ノ意見ニ依レバ條約違反トナル何ラカノ措置ニ  
出テタル場合乙國ハ本條約ノ他締約國ニ告クル以前  
ニ先ツ甲國ニ交渉スベシ、之ハ普通ノ方法ナリ、若

Aug Dec 26 1917

シ甲乙兩國ノ新ル直接交渉ガ役ニ立タサル場合  
乙國ノ諸口ニ對シ「充分ニ且卒直ニ」通報スルコ  
トヲ得。以上ハ普通ノ遣リ方ニテ新ル提案ニハ別ニ  
新計ナルモノヲ認メズ

委員長曰ク 本條ニハ何ラ新シキ點ナシ本條ハ既ニ  
本會議ニ參加セル諸口ノ聯繫的精神ヲ具現シタルモ  
ノニスキス「完全且卒直ニ」トノ文言ハ澤山ノ條約  
ニ於リ、各口ハ如何ナル場合ニモオ互ニ「完全ニ且  
卒直ニ」通報シ合ヒ得ルモノニシテ又友好口間ニホ  
イテハ多分實際ニモソノ様トスベキヲ以テ本文書ハ  
別案ノ意味ヲ有スルモノニ非ス



not used

Def. Doc. #2067

Exh. 5

Errata Sheet

正誤表

辯護側文書第二〇六七號

太平洋及極東問題首席代表委員分科會議事錄抜萃（大正十年……十一年

華府會議ニト題スル

本文第一行

幣原男爵、第六條ノ……ハ

第七條ノ誤ニ付訂正願ヒマス